

ON SHIFT HARNACK INEQUALITIES FOR SUBORDINATE SEMIGROUPS AND MOMENT ESTIMATES FOR LÉVY PROCESSES

CHANG-SONG DENG AND RENÉ L. SCHILLING

ABSTRACT. We show that shift Harnack type inequalities (in the sense of F.-Y. Wang [16]) are preserved under Bochner's subordination. The proofs are based on two types of moment estimates for subordinators. As a by-product we establish moment estimates for general Lévy processes.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

Subordination in the sense of Bochner is a method to generate new ('subordinate') stochastic processes from a given process by a random time change with an independent one-dimensional increasing Lévy process ('subordinator'). A corresponding notion exists at the level of semigroups. If the original process is a Lévy process, so is the subordinate process. For instance, any symmetric α -stable Lévy process can be regarded as a subordinate Brownian motion, cf. [11]. This provides us with another approach to investigate jump processes via the corresponding results for diffusion processes. See [6] for the dimension-free Harnack inequality for subordinate semigroups, [12] for subordinate functional inequalities and [4] for the quasi-invariance property under subordination. In this paper, we will establish shift Harnack inequalities, which were introduced in [16], for subordinate semigroups.

Let $(S_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a subordinator. Being a one-sided Lévy process, it is uniquely determined by its Laplace transform which is of the form

$$\mathbb{E} e^{-uS_t} = e^{-t\phi(u)}, \quad u > 0, t \geq 0.$$

The characteristic exponent $\phi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a Bernstein function having the following Lévy–Khintchine representation

$$(1.1) \quad \phi(u) = bu + \int_{(0, \infty)} (1 - e^{-ux}) \nu(dx), \quad u > 0.$$

The drift parameter $b \geq 0$ and the Lévy measure ν —a measure on $(0, \infty)$ satisfying $\int_{(0, \infty)} (x \wedge 1) \nu(dx) < \infty$ —uniquely characterize the Bernstein function. The corresponding transition probabilities $\mu_t := \mathbb{P}(S_t \in \cdot)$ form a vaguely continuous convolution semigroup of probability measures on $[0, \infty)$, i.e. one has $\mu_{t+s} = \mu_t * \mu_s$ for all $t, s \geq 0$ and μ_t tends weakly to the Dirac measure concentrated at 0 as $t \rightarrow 0$.

If $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Markov process with transition semigroup $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$, then the subordinate process is given by the random time-change $X_t^\phi := X_{S_t}$. The process $(X_t^\phi)_{t \geq 0}$ is again a

Date: May 21, 2015.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60J75, 47G20, 60G51.

Key words and phrases. Shift Harnack inequality, subordination, subordinate semigroup, Lévy process.

The first-named author gratefully acknowledges support through the Alexander-von-Humboldt foundation, the National Natural Science Foundation of China (11401442) and the International Postdoctoral Exchange Fellowship Program (2013).

Markov process, and it is not hard to see that the subordinate semigroup is given by the Bochner integral

$$(1.2) \quad P_t^\phi f := \int_{[0,\infty)} P_s f \mu_t(ds), \quad t \geq 0, f \text{ bounded, measurable.}$$

The formula (1.2) makes sense for any Markov semigroup $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on any Banach space E and defines again a Markov semigroup. We refer to [11] for details, in particular for a functional calculus for the generator of $(P_t^\phi)_{t \geq 0}$. If $(S_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is an α -stable subordinator ($0 < \alpha < 1$), the dimension-free Harnack type inequalities in the sense of [13] were established in [6], see [14] for more details on such Harnack inequalities. For example, if $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the log-Harnack inequality

$$P_t \log f(x) \leq \log P_t f(y) + \Phi(t, x, y), \quad x, y \in E, t > 0, 1 \leq f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E)$$

for some function $\Phi : (0, \infty) \times E \times E \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, then a similar inequality holds for the subordinate semigroup $(P_t^\phi)_{t \geq 0}$; that is, the log-Harnack inequality is preserved under subordination. For the stability of the power-Harnack inequality, we need an additional condition on α : if the following power-Harnack inequality holds

$$(P_t f(x))^p \leq (P_t f^p(y)) \exp[\Phi(t, p, x, y)], \quad x, y \in E, t > 0, 0 \leq f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E),$$

where $p > 1$ and $\Phi(\cdot, p, x, y) : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a measurable function such that for some $\kappa > 0$

$$\Phi(t, p, x, y) = O(t^{-\kappa}) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0,$$

then $(P_t^\phi)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies also a power-Harnack inequality provided that $\alpha \in (\kappa/(1+\kappa), 1)$, see [6, Theorem 1.1]. We stress that the results of [6] hold for any subordinator whose Bernstein function satisfies $\phi(u) \geq Cu^\alpha$ for large values of u with some constant $C > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (as before, $\alpha \in (\kappa/(1+\kappa), 1)$ is needed for the power-Harnack inequality), see [17, Proof of Corollary 2.2].

Recently, new types of Harnack inequalities, called shift Harnack inequalities, have been proposed in [16]: A Markov semigroup $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the shift log-Harnack inequality if

$$(1.3) \quad P_t \log f(x) \leq \log P_t[f(\cdot + e)](x) + \Psi(t, e), \quad t > 0, 1 \leq f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E),$$

and the shift power-Harnack inequality with power $p > 1$ if

$$(1.4) \quad (P_t f(x))^p \leq (P_t[f^p(\cdot + e)](x)) \exp[\Phi(t, p, e)], \quad t > 0, 0 \leq f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E);$$

here, $x, e \in E$ and $\Psi(\cdot, e), \Phi(\cdot, p, e) : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ are measurable functions. These new Harnack type inequalities can be applied to heat kernel estimates and quasi-invariance properties of the underlying transition probability under shifts, see [16, 14] for details.

The power-Harnack and log-Harnack inequalities were established in [17] for a class of stochastic differential equations driven by additive noise containing a subordinate Brownian motion as additive component, see also [3] for an improvement and [18] for further developments. The shift power-Harnack inequality was also derived in [15] for this model by using the Malliavin's calculus and finite-jump approximations. In particular, when the noise is an α -stable process with $\alpha \in (1, 2)$, an explicit shift power-Harnack inequality was presented, cf. [15, Corollary 1.4 (3)]. However, shift log-Harnack inequalities for stochastic differential equations driven by jump processes have not yet been studied.

We want to consider the stability of shift Harnack inequalities under subordination. In many specific cases, see e.g. Example 2.5 in Section 2 below, $\Psi(s, e)$ and $\Phi(s, p, e)$ are of the form $C_1 s^{-\kappa_1} + C_2 s^{\kappa_2} + C_3$, with constants $C_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, depending only on $e \in E$ and $p > 1$, and exponents $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 > 0$. As it turns out, this means that we have to control $\mathbb{E} S_t^\kappa$, $\kappa \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, for the shift log-Harnack inequality and $\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda S_t^\kappa}$, $\lambda > 0$ and

$\kappa \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, for the shift power-Harnack inequality. Throughout the paper, we use the convention that $\frac{1}{0} := \infty$.

Since moment estimates for stochastic processes are interesting on their own, we study such (exponential) moment estimates first for general Lévy processes, and then for subordinators. For real-valued Lévy processes without Brownian component estimates for the p th ($p > 0$) moment were investigated in [8] and [7] via the Blumenthal–Gettoor index introduced in [2]. While the focus of these papers were short-time asymptotics, we need estimates also for $t \gg 1$ which require a different set of indices for the underlying processes.

Let us briefly indicate how the paper is organized. In Section 2 we establish the shift Harnack type inequalities for the subordinate semigroup P_t^ϕ from the corresponding inequalities for P_t . Some practical conditions are presented to ensure the stability of the shift Harnack inequality under subordination; in Example 2.5 we illustrate our results using a class of stochastic differential equations. Section 3 is devoted to moment estimates of Lévy processes: Subsection 3.1 contains, under various conditions, several concrete (non-)existence results and estimates for moments, while Subsection 3.2 provides the estimates for $\mathbb{E}S_t^\kappa$ and $\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda S_t^\kappa}$ which were used in Section 2. Finally, we show in Section 4 that the index β_0 of a Lévy symbol at the origin satisfies $\beta_0 \in [0, 2]$. As usual, we indicate by subscripts that a positive constant $C = C_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \dots}$ depends on the parameters $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \dots$.

2. SHIFT HARNACK INEQUALITIES FOR SUBORDINATE SEMIGROUPS

In this section, we use the moment estimates for subordinators from Section 3 to establish shift Harnack inequalities for subordinate semigroups. Let $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a Markov semigroup on a Banach space E and $S = (S_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a subordinator whose characteristic (Laplace) exponent ϕ is the Bernstein function given by (1.1). Recall that the subordinate semigroup $(P_t^\phi)_{t \geq 0}$ is defined by (1.2).

First, we introduce two indices for subordinators:

$$(2.1) \quad \sigma_0 := \sup \left\{ \alpha : \lim_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{\phi(u)}{u^\alpha} = 0 \right\},$$

$$(2.2) \quad \rho_\infty := \sup \left\{ \alpha : \liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi(u)}{u^\alpha} > 0 \right\} = \inf \left\{ \alpha : \liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi(u)}{u^\alpha} = 0 \right\}.$$

Since

$$(2.3) \quad \lim_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{\phi(u)}{u} = \lim_{u \downarrow 0} \phi'(u) = b + \lim_{u \downarrow 0} \int_{(0, \infty)} x e^{-ux} \nu(dx) = b + \int_{(0, \infty)} x \nu(dx) \in (0, \infty],$$

it is clear that $\sigma_0 \in [0, 1]$. Moreover, the following formula holds, see [4]:

$$(2.4) \quad \sigma_0 = \sup \left\{ \alpha : \limsup_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{\phi(u)}{u^\alpha} < \infty \right\} = \sup \left\{ \alpha \leq 1 : \int_{y \geq 1} y^\alpha \nu(dy) < \infty \right\}.$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$, noting that

$$0 \leq \frac{\phi(u)}{u^{1+\epsilon}} \leq \frac{b}{u^\epsilon} + \frac{1}{u^\epsilon} \int_{(0,1)} x \nu(dx) + \frac{1}{u^{1+\epsilon}} \nu(x \geq 1), \quad u > 0,$$

yields

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi(u)}{u^{1+\epsilon}} = 0,$$

one has $\rho_\infty \leq 1 + \epsilon$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $\rho_\infty \in [0, 1]$.

Remark 2.1. We will frequently use the condition $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)u^{-\rho} > 0$ for some $\rho \in (c, \rho_\infty]$, where $c \geq 0$. This is clearly equivalent to either $c < \rho < \rho_\infty$ or $\rho = \rho_\infty > c$ and $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)u^{-\rho_\infty} > 0$.

Assume that P_t satisfies the following shift log-Harnack inequality

$$(2.5) \quad P_t \log f(x) \leq \log P_t[f(\cdot + e)](x) + \frac{C_1(e)}{t^{\kappa_1}} + C_2(e)t^{\kappa_2} + C_3(e), \quad t > 0, 1 \leq f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E),$$

for some $x, e \in E$; here $\kappa_1 > 0$, $\kappa_2 \in (0, 1]$, and $C_i(e) \geq 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, are constants depending only on e . We are going to show that the subordinate semigroup P_t^ϕ satisfies a similar shift log-Harnack inequality. The following assumptions on the subordinator will be important:

(H1) $\kappa_1 > 0$ and $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)u^{-\rho} > 0$ for some $\rho \in (0, \rho_\infty]$.¹

(H2) $\kappa_2 \in (0, 1]$ satisfies $\int_{y \geq 1} y^{\kappa_2} \nu(dy) < \infty$.

(H3) $\kappa_2 \in (0, 1]$ satisfies $\inf_{\theta \in [\kappa_2, 1]} \int_{y > 0} y^\theta \nu(dy) < \infty$.

(H4) $\kappa_2 \in (0, \sigma)$, where $\sigma \in (0, \sigma_0]$ satisfies $\limsup_{u \downarrow 0} \phi(u)u^{-\sigma} < \infty$.²

Note that by (2.4), (H4) is strictly stronger than (H2).

Theorem 2.2. Suppose that P_t satisfies (2.5) for some $x, e \in E$. In each of the following cases the subordinate semigroup P_t^ϕ satisfies also a shift log-Harnack inequality

$$(2.6) \quad P_t^\phi \log f(x) \leq \log P_t^\phi[f(\cdot + e)](x) + \Psi(t, e), \quad t > 0, 1 \leq f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E).$$

a) Assume (H1) and (H2). Then (2.6) holds with $\Psi(t, e)$ of the form

$$C_1(e) \frac{C_{\kappa_1, \rho}}{(t \wedge 1)^{\kappa_1/\rho}} + C_2(e)C_{\kappa_2}(t \vee 1) + C_3(e).$$

b) Assume (H1) and (H3). Then (2.6) holds with $\Psi(t, e)$ of the form

$$C_1(e) \frac{C_{\kappa_1, \rho}}{(t \wedge 1)^{\kappa_1/\rho}} + C_2(e)C_{\kappa_2}(t \vee 1)^{\kappa_2} + C_3(e).$$

c) Assume (H1) and (H4). Then (2.6) holds with $\Psi(t, e)$ of the form

$$C_1(e) \frac{C_{\kappa_1, \rho}}{(t \wedge 1)^{\kappa_1/\rho}} + C_2(e)C_{\kappa_2, \sigma}(t \vee 1)^{\kappa_2/\sigma} + C_3(e).$$

Proof. Because of (2.5) the shift log-Harnack inequality (1.3) for P_t holds with $\Psi(s, e) = C_1(e)s^{-\kappa_1} + C_2(e)s^{\kappa_2} + C_3(e)$. Note that (H1) implies $\phi(u) \rightarrow \infty$ as $u \rightarrow \infty$, hence excluding the compound Poisson subordinator, so

$$\mu_t(\{0\}) = \mathbb{P}(S_t = 0) = 0, \quad t > 0.$$

By Jensen's inequality we find for all $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} P_t^\phi \log f(x) &= \int_{(0, \infty)} P_s \log f(x) \mu_t(ds) \\ &\leq \int_{(0, \infty)} [\log P_s[f(\cdot + e)](x) + \Psi(s, e)] \mu_t(ds) \\ &\leq \log \int_{(0, \infty)} P_s[f(\cdot + e)](x) \mu_t(ds) + \int_{(0, \infty)} \Psi(s, e) \mu_t(ds) \end{aligned}$$

¹This is equivalent to either $0 < \rho < \rho_\infty$ or $\rho = \rho_\infty > 0$ and $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)u^{-\rho_\infty} > 0$, see Remark 2.1.

²In analogy to Remark 2.1, this is equivalent to either $0 < \sigma < \sigma_0$ or $\sigma = \sigma_0 > 0$ and $\limsup_{u \downarrow 0} \phi(u)u^{-\sigma_0} < \infty$.

$$= \log P_t^\phi[f(\cdot + e)](x) + \int_{(0,\infty)} \Psi(s, e) \mu_t(ds).$$

Therefore,

$$P_t^\phi \log f(x) \leq \log P_t^\phi[f(\cdot + e)](x) + C_1(e) \mathbb{E} S_t^{-\kappa_1} + C_2(e) \mathbb{E} S_t^{\kappa_2} + C_3(e)$$

and the desired estimates follow from the corresponding moment bounds in Section 3. $\square$

Now we turn to the shift power-Harnack inequality for P_t^ϕ . We will assume that for some $p > 1$ and $x, e \in E$, P_t satisfies the following shift power-Harnack inequality

$$(2.7) \quad (P_t f(x))^p \leq (P_t[f^p(\cdot + e)](x)) \exp \left[\frac{H_1(p, e)}{t^{\kappa_1}} + H_2(p, e) t^{\kappa_2} + H_3(p, e) \right],$$

$$t > 0, 0 \leq f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E),$$

where $\kappa_1 > 0$, $\kappa_2 \in (0, 1]$ and $H_i(p, e) \geq 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, are constants depending on p and e .

Theorem 2.3. *Assume that P_t satisfies (2.7) for some $p > 1$ and $x, e \in E$, and $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u) u^{-\rho} > 0$ for some $\rho \in (\kappa_1/(1 + \kappa_1), \rho_\infty]$.³ If*

$$\int_{y \geq 1} \exp \left[\frac{r H_2(p, e)}{p - 1} y^{\kappa_2} \right] \nu(dy) < \infty$$

holds for some $r > 1$, then the subordinate semigroup P_t^ϕ satisfies the shift power-Harnack inequality (1.4) with an exponent $\Phi(t, p, e)$ given by

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{C_{\kappa_1, \rho, p, r, e}}{(t \wedge 1)^{\frac{\kappa_1}{\rho - (1 - \rho)\kappa_1}}} + C_{\kappa_2, p, r, e}(t \vee 1) + H_3(p, e).$$

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 2.2, we see $\mu_t(\{0\}) = 0$ for any $t > 0$. By (2.7) and the Hölder inequality one has

$$\begin{aligned} (P_t^\phi f(x))^p &= \left(\int_{(0,\infty)} P_s f(x) \mu_t(ds) \right)^p \\ &\leq \left(\int_{(0,\infty)} (P_s[f^p(\cdot + e)](x))^{\frac{1}{p}} \exp \left[\frac{H_1(p, e)}{p s^{\kappa_1}} + \frac{H_2(p, e)}{p} s^{\kappa_2} + \frac{H_3(p, e)}{p} \right] \mu_t(ds) \right)^p \\ &\leq \left(\int_{(0,\infty)} P_s[f^p(\cdot + e)](x) \mu_t(ds) \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(\int_{(0,\infty)} \exp \left[\frac{H_1(p, e)}{(p - 1) s^{\kappa_1}} + \frac{H_2(p, e)}{p - 1} s^{\kappa_2} + \frac{H_3(p, e)}{p - 1} \right] \mu_t(ds) \right)^{p-1} \\ &= (P_t^\phi[f^p(\cdot + e)](x)) e^{H_3(p, e)} \left(\mathbb{E} \exp \left[\frac{H_1(p, e)}{p - 1} S_t^{-\kappa_1} + \frac{H_2(p, e)}{p - 1} S_t^{\kappa_2} \right] \right)^{p-1} \\ &\leq (P_t^\phi[f^p(\cdot + e)](x)) e^{H_3(p, e)} \\ &\quad \times \left(\mathbb{E} \exp \left[\frac{r H_1(p, e)}{(r - 1)(p - 1)} S_t^{-\kappa_1} \right] \right)^{\frac{(r-1)(p-1)}{r}} \left(\mathbb{E} \exp \left[\frac{r H_2(p, e)}{p - 1} S_t^{\kappa_2} \right] \right)^{\frac{p-1}{r}}. \end{aligned}$$

³This is equivalent to either $\kappa_1/(1 + \kappa_1) < \rho < \rho_\infty$ or $\rho = \rho_\infty > \kappa_1/(1 + \kappa_1)$ and $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u) u^{-\rho_\infty} > 0$, see Remark 2.1.

By Theorem 3.8 b) in Section 3,

$$\left(\mathbb{E} \exp \left[\frac{r H_1(p, e)}{(r-1)(p-1)} S_t^{-\kappa_1} \right] \right)^{\frac{(r-1)(p-1)}{r}} \leq \exp \left[\frac{C_{\kappa_1, \rho, p, r, e}}{(t \wedge 1)^{\frac{\kappa_1}{\rho - (1-\rho)\kappa_1}}} \right].$$

On the other hand, it follows from Theorem 3.3 a) below that

$$\left(\mathbb{E} \exp \left[\frac{r H_2(p, e)}{p-1} S_t^{\kappa_2} \right] \right)^{\frac{p-1}{r}} \leq \exp [C_{\kappa_2, p, r, e}(t \vee 1)].$$

Combining the above estimates finishes the proof. $\square$

Remark 2.4. By Theorem 3.8 b) below, in (2.8) $C_{\kappa_1, \rho, p, r, e}$ can be explicitly given as a function of p, r, e . In order to write $C_{\kappa_2, p, r, e}$ in (2.8) explicitly as a function of p, r, e , we need some additional condition. If $\int_{(0,1)} |y|^{\kappa_2} \nu(dy) < \infty$, this can be easily realized by using Theorem 3.3 b) below. If $\nu(y \geq 1) = 0$, then we can use [9, Theorem 25.17]: for any $\lambda > 0$, $\kappa_2 \in (0, 1]$ and $t > 0$

$$\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda S_t^{\kappa_2}} \leq \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda(1 \vee S_t)} \leq e^\lambda \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda S_t} = \exp \left[\lambda + t \left(b\lambda + \int_{(0,1)} (e^{\lambda y} - 1) \nu(dy) \right) \right].$$

Example 2.5. Consider the following stochastic differential equation on $\mathbb{R}^d$:

$$(2.9) \quad dX_t = l_t(X_t) dt + \Sigma_t dW_t,$$

where $l : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\Sigma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ are measurable and locally bounded, and $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion. We assume the following conditions on l and Σ :

(A1) There exists a locally bounded measurable function $K : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

$$|l_t(x) - l_t(y)| \leq K_t |x - y|, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad t \geq 0.$$

(A2) For each $t \geq 0$, the matrix Σ_t is invertible and there exists a measurable function $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that $\gamma \in L_{\text{loc}}^2([0, \infty))$ and $\|\Sigma_t^{-1}\| \leq \gamma_t$ for all $t \geq 0$.

It is well known that (A1) ensures that (2.9) has for each starting point $X_0 = x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ a unique solution $(X_t^x)_{t \geq 0}$ with infinite life-time. By P_t we denote the associated Markov semigroup, i.e.

$$P_t f(x) = \mathbb{E} f(X_t^x), \quad t \geq 0, \quad f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Assume that for some $\kappa_1 \geq 1$ and $\kappa_2 \in (0, 1]$

$$(2.10) \quad \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t^{2-\kappa_1}} \int_0^t \gamma_r^2 (r K_r + 1)^2 dr < \infty,$$

$$(2.11) \quad \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t^{2+\kappa_2}} \int_0^t \gamma_r^2 (r K_r + 1)^2 dr < \infty.$$

Typical examples for K and γ satisfying (2.10) and (2.11) are

- $\gamma_s = 1$ and $K_s = s^\theta \wedge 1$ for $\theta \leq 0$. Then it is easy to see that (2.10) is fulfilled with $\kappa_1 \geq 1$ and (2.11) is satisfied with $\kappa_2 \in [(2\theta + 1) \vee 0, 1] \setminus \{0\}$.
- $\gamma_s = \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(s) + s^\theta \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(s)$ for $\theta \in (-1/2, 0]$ and $K_s = 1 \vee (\log s)$. Then (2.10) holds with $\kappa_1 \geq 1 - 2\theta$ and (2.11) holds with $\kappa_2 \in (1 + 2\theta, 1]$.

We are going to show that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$ and $x, e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the following shift log- and power- $(p > 1)$ -Harnack inequalities hold:

$$P_t \log f(x) \leq \log P_t[f(\cdot + e)](x) + C|e|^2 \left(\frac{1}{t^{\kappa_1}} + t^{\kappa_2} + 1 \right), \quad 1 \leq f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

$$(P_t f(x))^p \leq (P_t[f^p(\cdot + e)](x)) \exp \left[\frac{Cp|e|^2}{p-1} \left(\frac{1}{t^{\kappa_1}} + t^{\kappa_2} + 1 \right) \right], \quad 0 \leq f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

In particular, Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 can be applied.

Although the proof of Example 2.5 relies on known arguments, see e.g. [16, 14], we include the complete proof for the convenience of the reader.

Proof of Example 2.5. Fix $t > 0$ and $x, e \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We adopt the new coupling argument from [16] (see also [14]) to construct another process $(Y_s^x)_{s \geq 0}$ also starting from x such that $Y_t^x - X_t^x = e$ at the fixed time t . The process $(Y_s^x)_{s \geq 0}$ is the solution of the following equation

$$(2.12) \quad dY_s^x = l_s(X_s^x) ds + \Sigma_s dW_s + \frac{e}{t} ds, \quad Y_0^x = x.$$

Clearly,

$$(2.13) \quad Y_r^x - X_r^x = \int_0^r \frac{e}{t} ds = \frac{r}{t} e, \quad 0 \leq r \leq t,$$

and, in particular, $Y_t^x - X_t^x = e$. Rewrite (2.12) as

$$dY_s^x = l_s(Y_s^x) ds + \Sigma_s d\widetilde{W}_s, \quad Y_0^x = x,$$

where

$$\widetilde{W}_s := W_s + \int_0^s \Sigma_r^{-1} \left(l_r(X_r^x) - l_r(Y_r^x) + \frac{e}{t} \right) dr, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t.$$

Let

$$M_s := \int_0^s \Sigma_r^{-1} \left(l_r(X_r^x) - l_r(Y_r^x) + \frac{e}{t} \right) dW_r, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t.$$

Since it follows from **(A2)**, **(A1)** and (2.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \Sigma_r^{-1} \left(l_r(X_r^x) - l_r(Y_r^x) + \frac{e}{t} \right) \right| &\leq \gamma_r \left| l_r(X_r^x) - l_r(Y_r^x) + \frac{e}{t} \right| \\ &\leq \gamma_r \left(K_r |X_r^x - Y_r^x| + \frac{|e|}{t} \right) \\ &= \frac{|e|}{t} \gamma_r (rK_r + 1), \quad 0 \leq r \leq t, \end{aligned}$$

the compensator of the martingale M satisfies

$$(2.14) \quad \langle M \rangle_t = \int_0^t \left| \Sigma_r^{-1} \left(l_r(X_r^x) - l_r(Y_r^x) + \frac{e}{t} \right) \right|^2 dr \leq \frac{|e|^2}{t^2} \int_0^t \gamma_r^2 (rK_r + 1)^2 dr.$$

Set

$$R_t := \exp \left[-M_t - \frac{1}{2} \langle M \rangle_t \right].$$

Novikov's criterion shows that $\mathbb{E}R_t = 1$. By the Girsanov theorem, $(\widetilde{W}_s)_{0 \leq s \leq t}$ is a d -dimensional Brownian motion under the probability measure $R_t \mathbb{P}$.

To derive the shift log-Harnack inequality for P_t , we first note that (2.14) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \log R_t &= -M_t - \frac{1}{2} \langle M \rangle_t \\ &= - \int_0^t \Sigma_r^{-1} \left(l_r(X_r^x) - l_r(Y_r^x) + \frac{e}{t} \right) d\widetilde{W}_r + \frac{1}{2} \langle M \rangle_t \\ &\leq - \int_0^t \Sigma_r^{-1} \left(l_r(X_r^x) - l_r(Y_r^x) + \frac{e}{t} \right) d\widetilde{W}_r + \frac{|e|^2}{2t^2} \int_0^t \gamma_r^2 (rK_r + 1)^2 dr. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{E}R_t = 1$, we find with the Jensen inequality for any random variable $F \geq 1$

$$\int R_t \log \frac{F}{R_t} d\mathbb{P} \leq \log \int F d\mathbb{P}, \quad \text{hence,} \quad \int R_t \log F d\mathbb{P} \leq \log \int F d\mathbb{P} + \int R_t \log R_t d\mathbb{P}.$$

Thus, we get for any $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $f \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} P_t \log f(x) &= \mathbb{E}_{R_t \mathbb{P}} \log f(Y_t^x) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[R_t \log f(X_t^x + e)] \\ &\leq \log \mathbb{E}f(X_t^x + e) + \mathbb{E}[R_t \log R_t] \\ (2.15) \quad &= \log P_t[f(\cdot + e)](x) + \mathbb{E}_{R_t \mathbb{P}} \log R_t \\ &\leq \log P_t[f(\cdot + e)](x) + \frac{|e|^2}{2t^2} \int_0^t \gamma_r^2(rK_r + 1)^2 dr. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for any $p > 1$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $f \geq 0$, we deduce with the Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} (P_t f(x))^p &= (\mathbb{E}_{R_t \mathbb{P}} f(Y_t^x))^p \\ &= (\mathbb{E}[R_t f(X_t^x + e)])^p \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E}f^p(X_t^x + e)) \left(\mathbb{E}R_t^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \right)^{p-1} \\ &= (P_t[f^p(\cdot + e)](x)) \left(\mathbb{E}R_t^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \right)^{p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Because of (2.14), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}R_t^{\frac{p}{p-1}} &= \mathbb{E} \exp \left[\frac{p}{2(p-1)^2} \langle M \rangle_t - \frac{p}{p-1} M_t - \frac{p^2}{2(p-1)^2} \langle M \rangle_t \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left[\frac{p}{2(p-1)^2} \cdot \frac{|e|^2}{t^2} \int_0^t \gamma_r^2(rK_r + 1)^2 dr \right] \mathbb{E} \exp \left[-\frac{p}{p-1} M_t - \frac{p^2}{2(p-1)^2} \langle M \rangle_t \right] \\ &= \exp \left[\frac{p|e|^2}{2(p-1)^2 t^2} \int_0^t \gamma_r^2(rK_r + 1)^2 dr \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step we have used the fact that $\exp \left[-\frac{p}{p-1} M_t - \frac{p^2}{2(p-1)^2} \langle M \rangle_t \right]$ is a martingale; this is due to (2.14) and Novikov's criterion. Therefore,

$$(2.16) \quad (P_t f(x))^p \leq (P_t[f^p(\cdot + e)](x)) \exp \left[\frac{p|e|^2}{2(p-1)t^2} \int_0^t \gamma_r^2(rK_r + 1)^2 dr \right]$$

holds for all $p > 1$ and non-negative $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Finally, it remains to observe that (2.10) and (2.11) imply that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{t^2} \int_0^t \gamma_r^2(rK_r + 1)^2 dr \leq 2C \left(\frac{1}{t^{\kappa_1}} + t^{\kappa_2} + 1 \right) \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

Substituting this into (2.15) and (2.16), respectively, we obtain the desired shift log- and power-Harnack inequalities. $\square$

3. MOMENT ESTIMATES FOR LÉVY PROCESSES

3.1. General Lévy processes. A Lévy process $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a d -dimensional stochastic process with stationary and independent increments and almost surely càdlàg (right-continuous with finite left limits) paths $t \mapsto X_t$. As usual, we assume that $X_0 = 0$. Our standard references are [9, 5]. Since Lévy processes are (strong) Markov processes,

they are completely characterized by the law of X_t , hence by the characteristic function of X_t . It is well known that

$$\mathbb{E}e^{i\xi \cdot X_t} = e^{-t\psi(\xi)}, \quad t > 0, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where the characteristic exponent (Lévy symbol) $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is given by the Lévy–Khintchine formula

$$\psi(\xi) = -i\ell \cdot \xi + \frac{1}{2}\xi \cdot Q\xi + \int_{y \neq 0} (1 - e^{i\xi \cdot y} + i\xi \cdot y \mathbf{1}_{(0,1)}(|y|)) \nu(dy),$$

where $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the drift coefficient, Q is a non-negative semidefinite $d \times d$ matrix, and ν is the Lévy measure on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ satisfying $\int_{y \neq 0} (1 \wedge |y|^2) \nu(dy) < \infty$. The Lévy triplet (ℓ, Q, ν) uniquely determines ψ , hence X . The infinitesimal generator of X is given by

$$\mathcal{L}f = \ell \cdot \nabla f + \frac{1}{2}\nabla \cdot Q\nabla f + \int_{y \neq 0} (f(y + \cdot) - f - y \cdot \nabla f \mathbf{1}_{(0,1)}(|y|)) \nu(dy), \quad f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

First, we consider $\mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa$ for $\kappa \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Recall, cf. [9, Theorem 25.3], that the Lévy process X has a κ th ($\kappa > 0$) moment, i.e. $\mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa < \infty$ for some (hence, all) $t > 0$, if and only if

$$(3.1) \quad \int_{|y| \geq 1} |y|^\kappa \nu(dy) < \infty.$$

To present our results, we also need to introduce four indices for Lévy processes. Define the Blumenthal–Gettoor index β_∞ of a Lévy process by

$$\beta_\infty := \inf \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\psi(\xi)|}{|\xi|^\alpha} = 0 \right\}.$$

Clearly, $\beta_\infty \in [0, 2]$. For a Lévy process without diffusion part and dominating drift, this coincides with Blumenthal–and–Gettoor’s original definition based on the Lévy measure ν , cf. [2, 10], i.e.

$$\beta_\infty = \inf \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \int_{0 < |y| < 1} |y|^\alpha \nu(dy) < \infty \right\}.$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that

$$(3.2) \quad \beta_\infty = \inf \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\psi(\xi)|}{|\xi|^\alpha} = 0 \right\} = \inf \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\psi(\xi)|}{|\xi|^\alpha} < \infty \right\}.$$

In Section 2 we have introduced the index σ_0 for subordinators using the characteristic Laplace exponent (Bernstein function) ϕ . A similar index exists for a general Lévy process X —it is the counterpart at the origin of the classical Blumenthal–Gettoor index—but its definition is based on the characteristic exponent ψ :

$$(3.3) \quad \beta_0 := \sup \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\psi(\xi)|}{|\xi|^\alpha} = 0 \right\}.$$

It holds that $\beta_0 \in [0, 2]$, see the appendix (Section 4) for an easy proof. As in (3.2), one has

$$\beta_0 = \sup \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\psi(\xi)|}{|\xi|^\alpha} = 0 \right\} = \sup \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\psi(\xi)|}{|\xi|^\alpha} < \infty \right\}.$$

Moreover, for a Lévy process without dominating drift, it holds that, cf. [10],

$$\beta_0 = \sup \left\{ \alpha \leq 2 : \int_{|y| \geq 1} |y|^\alpha \nu(dy) < \infty \right\}.$$

Let

$$\delta_\infty := \sup \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi)}{|\xi|^\alpha} > 0 \right\} = \inf \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi)}{|\xi|^\alpha} = 0 \right\},$$

$$\delta_0 := \inf \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \frac{\operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi)}{|\xi|^\alpha} > 0 \right\} = \sup \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \frac{\operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi)}{|\xi|^\alpha} = 0 \right\}.$$

Clearly, $0 \leq \delta_\infty \leq \beta_\infty \leq 2$ and $\beta_0 \leq \delta_0$. Note that $\delta_0 \in [0, \infty]$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let X be a Lévy process in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with Lévy triplet (ℓ, Q, ν) and characteristic exponent ψ .*

a) *Assume that $Q = 0$, $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ and (3.1) holds. Then for any $t > 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa &\leq |\ell|^\kappa t^\kappa + \left(\int_{|y| \geq 1} |y|^\kappa \nu(dy) \right) t \\ &\quad + 2 \left(\frac{d}{2} \kappa (3 - \kappa) \int_{0 < |y| < 1} |y|^2 \nu(dy) \right)^{\kappa/2} [1 + \nu(|y| \geq 1) t]^{1 - \kappa/2} t^{\kappa/2}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa \leq C_\kappa t$ for any $t \geq 1$.

b) *Assume that $Q = 0$, $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ and*

$$\inf_{\theta \in [\kappa, 1]} \int_{y \neq 0} |y|^\theta \nu(dy) < \infty.$$

Then for any $t > 0$

$$(3.4) \quad \mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa \leq \inf_{\theta \in [\kappa, 1]} \left[|\hat{\ell}|^\theta t^\theta + \left(\int_{y \neq 0} |y|^\theta \nu(dy) \right) t \right]^{\kappa/\theta},$$

where

$$(3.5) \quad \hat{\ell} := \ell - \int_{0 < |y| < 1} y \nu(dy).$$

In particular, $\mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa \leq C_\kappa t^\kappa$ for any $t \geq 1$.

c) *Assume that $\kappa \in (0, \beta)$, where $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$ satisfies $\limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} |\psi(\xi)| |\xi|^{-\beta} < \infty$.⁴ Then for any $t \geq 1$*

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa \leq C_{\kappa, \beta, d} t^{\kappa/\beta}.$$

If furthermore $\limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} |\psi(\xi)| |\xi|^{-\beta} < \infty$,⁵ then this estimate holds for all $t > 0$.

d) *Let $\kappa \in (0, d)$. If for some $\delta \in (0, \delta_\infty]$, $\liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi) |\xi|^{-\delta} > 0$,⁶ then for any $t \in (0, 1]$*

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t|^{-\kappa} \leq C_{\kappa, \delta, d} t^{-\kappa/\delta}.$$

If furthermore $\liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi) |\xi|^{-\delta} > 0$,⁷ then this estimate holds for all $t > 0$.

e) *If ψ is real-valued, then for any $\kappa \geq d$ and $t > 0$*

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t|^{-\kappa} = \infty.$$

⁴This is equivalent to either $0 < \beta < \beta_0$ or $\beta = \beta_0 > 0$ and $\limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} |\psi(\xi)| |\xi|^{-\beta_0} < \infty$.

⁵This is equivalent to either $\beta_\infty < \beta \leq \beta_0$ or $\beta = \beta_\infty \in (0, \beta_0]$ and $\limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} |\psi(\xi)| |\xi|^{-\beta_\infty} < \infty$.

⁶This is equivalent to either $0 < \delta < \delta_\infty$ or $\delta = \delta_\infty > 0$ and $\liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi) |\xi|^{-\delta_\infty} > 0$.

⁷This is equivalent to either $\delta_0 < \delta \leq \delta_\infty$ or $\delta = \delta_0 \in (0, \delta_\infty]$ and $\liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi) |\xi|^{-\delta_0} > 0$.

Remark 3.2. a) The technique (Taylor's theorem) used in the proof of Theorem 3.1 a) below (see also the proof of Theorem 3.3 a) below) can be used to get bounds on more general moments of Lévy processes, e.g. $\mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa$ with $\kappa > 1$. However, the cost we have to pay is that the estimates may be too rough.

b) It is well known that (cf. [9, Theorem 25.3]) the finiteness of moments of a Lévy process depends only on the tail behaviour of the underlying Lévy measure ν , i.e. on the big jumps. Theorem 3.1 b)—it is essentially contained in [8, Theorem 2.1], using a very different method (Laplace transform)—requires also a condition on the small jumps. This allows us to get a ‘clean’ formula for the t -dependence in (3.4).

c) Theorem 3.1 b) is sharp for the Gamma subordinator, see Example 3.5 below.

d) Let X be a symmetric α -stable Lévy process in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $0 < \alpha < 2$. Then $\psi(\xi) = |\xi|^\alpha$ and we can choose in Theorem 3.1 c) $\beta = \beta_0 = \beta_\infty = \alpha$. For $t > 0$ it is well known that $\mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa$ is finite if, and only if, $\kappa \in (0, \alpha) = (0, \beta)$, in which case $\mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa = t^{\kappa/\alpha} \mathbb{E}|X_1|^\kappa$. This means that Theorem 3.1 c) is sharp for symmetric α -stable Lévy processes.

e) If the Lévy process has no dominating drift, then $\limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} |\psi(\xi)| |\xi|^{-\beta} < \infty$ implies (3.1) for $\kappa \in (0, \beta)$. The converse, however, is in general wrong. Thus the conditions in parts a) and c) of Theorem 3.1 are incomparable.

f) For a one-dimensional symmetric α -stable Lévy process we have $\delta = \delta_\infty = \delta_0 = \alpha$. By the scaling property, we have $\mathbb{E}|X_t|^{-\kappa} = C_{\kappa, \alpha} t^{-\kappa/\alpha}$ for $\kappa \in (0, 1)$. Thus, Theorem 3.1 d) is sharp for symmetric α -stable Lévy processes in $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. a) Rewrite X_t as $X_t = \ell t + \widehat{X}_t$, $t \geq 0$, where $\widehat{X} = (\widehat{X}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the Lévy process in $\mathbb{R}^d$ generated by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}f = \int_{y \neq 0} (f(y + \cdot) - f - y \cdot \nabla f \mathbf{1}_{(0,1)}(|y|)) \nu(dy), \quad f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Noting that

$$(3.6) \quad (x + y)^a \leq x^a + y^a, \quad x, y \geq 0, \quad a \in [0, 1],$$

it suffices to show that for all $t > 0$

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\widehat{X}_t|^\kappa &\leq \left(\int_{|y| \geq 1} |y|^\kappa \nu(dy) \right) t \\ &\quad + 2 \left(\frac{d}{2} \kappa (3 - \kappa) \int_{0 < |y| < 1} |y|^2 \nu(dy) \right)^{\kappa/2} [1 + \nu(|y| \geq 1) t]^{1 - \kappa/2} t^{\kappa/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $t > 0$. Let

$$f(x) := (\epsilon + |x|^2)^{\kappa/2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and

$$(3.8) \quad \tau_n := \inf \left\{ s \geq 0 : |\widehat{X}_s| > n \right\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By the Dynkin formula we get for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\epsilon + |\widehat{X}_{t \wedge \tau_n}|^2 \right)^{\kappa/2} \right] - \epsilon^{\kappa/2} = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau_n)} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}f(\widehat{X}_s) ds \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau_n)} \left(\int_{|y| \geq 1} (f(\widehat{X}_s + y) - f(\widehat{X}_s)) \nu(dy) \right) ds \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau_n)} \left(\int_{0 < |y| < 1} (f(\widehat{X}_s + y) - f(\widehat{X}_s) - y \cdot \nabla f(\widehat{X}_s)) \nu(dy) \right) ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the two terms on the right side separately. For the first expression we have

$$(3.10) \quad \int_{|y| \geq 1} \left(f(\widehat{X}_s + y) - f(\widehat{X}_s) \right) \nu(dy) \leq \epsilon^{\kappa/2} \nu(|y| \geq 1) + \int_{|y| \geq 1} |y|^\kappa \nu(dy).$$

For the second term, we observe that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_j \partial x_i}(x) \right| &= \left| \kappa(\kappa - 2) (\epsilon + |x|^2)^{\kappa/2-2} x_i x_j + \kappa (\epsilon + |x|^2)^{\kappa/2-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i=j\}} \right| \\ &\leq \kappa(2 - \kappa) (\epsilon + |x|^2)^{\kappa/2-2} |x|^2 + \kappa (\epsilon + |x|^2)^{\kappa/2-1} \\ &\leq \kappa(2 - \kappa) \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1} + \kappa \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1} \\ &= \kappa(3 - \kappa) \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By Taylor's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\widehat{X}_s + y) - f(\widehat{X}_s) - y \cdot \nabla f(\widehat{X}_s) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_j \partial x_i}(\widehat{X}_s + \theta_{\widehat{X}_s, y} y) y_i y_j \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa(3 - \kappa) \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1} \sum_{i,j=1}^d |y_i y_j| \\ &\leq \frac{d}{2} \kappa(3 - \kappa) \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1} |y|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta_{\widehat{X}_s, y} \in [-1, 1]$ depends on $\widehat{X}_s$ and y . Thus, we get

$$\int_{0 < |y| < 1} \left(f(\widehat{X}_s + y) - f(\widehat{X}_s) - y \cdot \nabla f(\widehat{X}_s) \right) \nu(dy) \leq \frac{d}{2} \kappa(3 - \kappa) \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1} \int_{0 < |y| < 1} |y|^2 \nu(dy).$$

Combining this with (3.10) and (3.9), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[(\epsilon + |\widehat{X}_{t \wedge \tau_n}|^2)^{\kappa/2} \right] &\leq \epsilon^{\kappa/2} + \left(\epsilon^{\kappa/2} \nu(|y| \geq 1) + \int_{|y| \geq 1} |y|^\kappa \nu(dy) \right) \mathbb{E} [t \wedge \tau_n] \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{d}{2} \kappa(3 - \kappa) \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1} \int_{0 < |y| < 1} |y|^2 \nu(dy) \right) \mathbb{E} [t \wedge \tau_n]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tau_n \uparrow \infty$ as $n \uparrow \infty$, we can let $n \uparrow \infty$ and use the monotone convergence theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |\widehat{X}_t|^\kappa &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[(\epsilon + |\widehat{X}_t|^2)^{\kappa/2} \right] \\ &\leq \epsilon^{\kappa/2} + \left(\epsilon^{\kappa/2} \nu(|y| \geq 1) + \int_{|y| \geq 1} |y|^\kappa \nu(dy) + \frac{d}{2} \kappa(3 - \kappa) \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1} \int_{0 < |y| < 1} |y|^2 \nu(dy) \right) t \\ &= \left(\int_{|y| \geq 1} |y|^\kappa \nu(dy) \right) t \\ &\quad + [1 + \nu(|y| \geq 1) t] \epsilon^{\kappa/2} + \left[\frac{d}{2} \kappa(3 - \kappa) \left(\int_{0 < |y| < 1} |y|^2 \nu(dy) \right) t \right] \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we can optimize in $\epsilon > 0$, i.e. let

$$\epsilon \downarrow \frac{\frac{d}{2} \kappa(3 - \kappa) \left(\int_{0 < |y| < 1} |y|^2 \nu(dy) \right) t}{1 + \nu(|y| \geq 1) t},$$

to get (3.7).

b) Our assumption $\int_{0 < |y| < 1} |y| \nu(dy) < \infty$ entails that X has bounded variation. Therefore, $X_t = \hat{\ell}t + \tilde{X}_t$, $t \geq 0$, where $(\tilde{X}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a drift-free Lévy process with generator

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}f = \int_{y \neq 0} (f(y + \cdot) - f) \nu(dy), \quad f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Let

$$\sigma_n := \inf \{t : |\tilde{X}_t| > n\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It follows from Dynkin's formula and (3.6) that for any $\theta \in [\kappa, 1]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_{t \wedge \sigma_n}|^\theta = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \sigma_n)} \left(\int_{y \neq 0} (|\tilde{X}_s + y|^\theta - |\tilde{X}_s|^\theta) \nu(dy) \right) ds \right] \leq \left(\int_{y \neq 0} |y|^\theta \nu(dy) \right) t.$$

Since $\sigma_n \uparrow \infty$ as $n \uparrow \infty$, we can let $n \uparrow \infty$ and use the monotone convergence theorem to get

$$\mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_t|^\theta \leq \left(\int_{y \neq 0} |y|^\theta \nu(dy) \right) t.$$

Using (3.6) again, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t|^\theta \leq |\hat{\ell}|^\theta t^\theta + \mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_t|^\theta \leq |\hat{\ell}|^\theta t^\theta + \left(\int_{y \neq 0} |y|^\theta \nu(dy) \right) t.$$

Together with Jensen's inequality, this yields for any $\theta \in [\kappa, 1]$ and $t > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa \leq [\mathbb{E}|X_t|^\theta]^\kappa/\theta \leq \left[|\hat{\ell}|^\theta t^\theta + \left(\int_{y \neq 0} |y|^\theta \nu(dy) \right) t \right]^\kappa/\theta,$$

which implies the desired estimate.

c) Since $0 < \kappa < \beta \leq \beta_0 \leq 2$, we have, see e.g. [1, III.18.23],

$$|x|^\kappa = c_{\kappa,d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}} (1 - \cos(x \cdot \xi)) |\xi|^{-\kappa-d} d\xi, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where

$$c_{\kappa,d} := \frac{\kappa 2^{\kappa-1} \Gamma\left(\frac{\kappa+d}{2}\right)}{\pi^{d/2} \Gamma\left(1 - \frac{\kappa}{2}\right)}.$$

By Tonelli's theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa &= c_{\kappa,d} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}} (1 - \cos(X_t \cdot \xi)) |\xi|^{-\kappa-d} d\xi \right] \\ &= c_{\kappa,d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}} (1 - \operatorname{Re} \mathbb{E} e^{i X_t \cdot \xi}) |\xi|^{-\kappa-d} d\xi \\ &= c_{\kappa,d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}} (1 - \operatorname{Re} e^{-t\psi(\xi)}) |\xi|^{-\kappa-d} d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\operatorname{Re} \psi \geq 0$, we have

$$|1 - \operatorname{Re} e^{-t\psi(\xi)}| \leq |1 - e^{-t\psi(\xi)}| \leq 2 \wedge (t|\psi(\xi)|), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}.$$

If $\limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} |\psi(\xi)| |\xi|^{-\beta} < \infty$, then

$$(3.11) \quad |\psi(\xi)| \leq C_\beta |\xi|^\beta, \quad 0 < |\xi| \leq 1.$$

Thus, we find for all $t \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}|X_t|^\kappa &\leq c_{\kappa,d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}} [2 \wedge (t |\psi(\xi)|)] |\xi|^{-\kappa-d} d\xi \\
 &\leq c_{\kappa,d} \int_{0 < |\xi| \leq t^{-1/\beta}} t |\psi(\xi)| |\xi|^{-\kappa-d} d\xi + c_{\kappa,d} \int_{|\xi| > t^{-1/\beta}} 2 |\xi|^{-\kappa-d} d\xi \\
 (3.12) \quad &\leq c_{\kappa,d} C_\beta t \int_{0 < |\xi| \leq t^{-1/\beta}} |\xi|^{\beta-\kappa-d} d\xi + 2c_{\kappa,d} \int_{|\xi| > t^{-1/\beta}} |\xi|^{-\kappa-d} d\xi \\
 &= c_{\kappa,d} C_\beta t^{\kappa/\beta} \int_{0 < |\xi| \leq 1} |\xi|^{\beta-\kappa-d} d\xi + 2c_{\kappa,d} t^{\kappa/\beta} \int_{|\xi| > 1} |\xi|^{-\kappa-d} d\xi,
 \end{aligned}$$

which implies the first estimate. If furthermore $\limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} |\psi(\xi)| |\xi|^{-\beta} < \infty$, then (3.11) holds for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and so (3.12) holds true for all $t > 0$. This gives the second assertion.

d) Recall that

$$e^{-u|x|} = c_d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{u}{(u^2 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} e^{-i x \cdot \xi} d\xi, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, u > 0,$$

where

$$c_d := \pi^{-(d+1)/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{d+1}{2}\right).$$

Using Fourier transforms, we have for all $u > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{-d+\kappa} e^{-u|\xi|} e^{-i x \cdot \xi} d\xi = c'_{\kappa,d} c_d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^{-\kappa} \frac{u}{(u^2 + |y|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} dy,$$

where

$$c'_{\kappa,d} := 2^\kappa \pi^{d/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right) / \Gamma\left(\frac{d-\kappa}{2}\right).$$

This implies that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{-d+\kappa} e^{-n^{-1}|\xi|} \operatorname{Re} e^{i X_t \cdot \xi} d\xi &= c'_{\kappa,d} c_d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |X_t + y|^{-\kappa} \frac{n^{-1}}{(n^{-2} + |y|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} dy \\
 &= c'_{\kappa,d} c_d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |X_t + n^{-1}y|^{-\kappa} \frac{dy}{(1 + |y|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation and using Fubini's theorem, we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{-d+\kappa} e^{-n^{-1}|\xi|} \operatorname{Re} e^{-t\psi(\xi)} d\xi = c'_{\kappa,d} c_d \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |X_t + n^{-1}y|^{-\kappa} \frac{dy}{(1 + |y|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \right].$$

Combining this with Fatou's lemma and Tonelli's theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}|X_t|^{-\kappa} &= \mathbb{E}|X_t|^{-\kappa} \cdot c_d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{dy}{(1 + |y|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \\
 &= c_d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left[\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |X_t + n^{-1}y|^{-\kappa} \right] \frac{dy}{(1 + |y|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \\
 &\leq c_d \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |X_t + n^{-1}y|^{-\kappa} \frac{dy}{(1 + |y|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \right] \\
 &= \frac{1}{c'_{\kappa,d}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{-d+\kappa} e^{-n^{-1}|\xi|} \operatorname{Re} e^{-t\psi(\xi)} d\xi
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{c'_{\kappa,d}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{-d+\kappa} e^{-n^{-1}|\xi|} e^{-t \operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi)} d\xi \\
&= \frac{1}{c'_{\kappa,d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{-d+\kappa} e^{-t \operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi)} d\xi,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the monotone convergence theorem. If $\liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi) |\xi|^{-\delta} > 0$, then there exist constants $C_1 = C_1(\delta) > 0$ and $C_2 = C_2(\delta) \geq 0$ such that

$$(3.13) \quad \operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi) \geq C_1 |\xi|^\delta, \quad |\xi| \geq C_2.$$

Thus, we find for all $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.14) \quad \mathbb{E}|X_t|^{-\kappa} &\leq \frac{1}{c'_{\kappa,d}} \left(\int_{|\xi| \leq C_2} |\xi|^{-d+\kappa} d\xi + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{-d+\kappa} e^{-t C_1 |\xi|^\delta} d\xi \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{c'_{\kappa,d}} \left(\int_{|\xi| \leq C_2} |\xi|^{-d+\kappa} d\xi + t^{-\kappa/\delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{-d+\kappa} e^{-C_1 |\xi|^\delta} d\xi \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This gives the first assertion. If furthermore $\liminf_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi) |\xi|^{-\delta} > 0$, then (3.13) holds with $C_2 = 0$, so that the second assertion follows by using (3.14) with $C_2 = 0$.

e) Using

$$(3.15) \quad \frac{1}{y^r} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(r)} \int_0^\infty e^{-uy} u^{r-1} du, \quad r > 0, y \geq 0$$

and the Fourier transform formula from the beginning of part d), we get by Tonelli's theorem that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|X_t|^{-\kappa} &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\kappa)} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-u|X_t|} u^{\kappa-1} du \right] \\
&= \frac{c_d}{\Gamma(\kappa)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i X_t \cdot \xi} \frac{u}{(u^2 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} d\xi \right] u^{\kappa-1} du.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\psi(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $0 < e^{-t\psi(\xi)} \leq 1$, and we can use Fubini's theorem for the inner integrals and then Tonelli's theorem for the two outer integrals to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|X_t|^{-\kappa} &= \frac{c_d}{\Gamma(\kappa)} \int_0^\infty \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-t\psi(\xi)} \frac{u}{(u^2 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} d\xi \right) u^{\kappa-1} du \\
&= \frac{c_d}{\Gamma(\kappa)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\int_0^\infty \frac{u^\kappa}{(u^2 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} du \right) e^{-t\psi(\xi)} d\xi \\
&\geq \frac{c_d}{\Gamma(\kappa)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\int_{|\xi|}^\infty \frac{u^\kappa}{(u^2 + u^2)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} du \right) e^{-t\psi(\xi)} d\xi \\
&= \frac{c_d}{2^{\frac{d+1}{2}} \Gamma(\kappa)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\int_{|\xi|}^\infty u^{\kappa-d-1} du \right) e^{-t\psi(\xi)} d\xi = \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from $\kappa \geq d$. □

Let us now consider $\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda |X_t|^\kappa}$ for $\lambda > 0$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. For $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ the function $\mathbb{R}^d \ni x \mapsto e^{\lambda |x|^\kappa} \in \mathbb{R}$ is submultiplicative; thus, $\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda |X_t|^\kappa} < \infty$ for some (hence, all) $t > 0$ if, and only if,

$$(3.16) \quad \int_{|y| \geq 1} e^{\lambda |y|^\kappa} \nu(dy) < \infty,$$

see [9, Theorem 25.3].

Theorem 3.3. *Let X be a Lévy process in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with Lévy triplet (ℓ, Q, ν) and characteristic exponent ψ .*

a) *If $Q = 0$, $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ and (3.16) holds, then for any $\lambda > 0$ there is some (non-explicit) constant $C_{\kappa, \lambda} > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda |X_t|^\kappa} \leq \begin{cases} e^{C_{\kappa, \lambda} t^{\kappa/2}}, & \text{if } t < 1, \\ e^{C_{\kappa, \lambda} t}, & \text{if } t \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

b) *If $Q = 0$, $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, (3.16) holds and*

$$(3.17) \quad \int_{0 < |y| < 1} |y|^\kappa \nu(dy) < \infty,$$

then for any $\lambda, t > 0$

$$\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda |X_t|^\kappa} \leq \exp \left[\lambda |\hat{\ell}|^\kappa t^\kappa + M_{\kappa, \lambda} t \right],$$

where $\hat{\ell}$ is given by (3.5) and

$$M_{\kappa, \lambda} := \int_{y \neq 0} (e^{\lambda |y|^\kappa} - 1) \nu(dy).$$

c) *If $\nu \neq 0$ and $\kappa > 1$, then for any $\lambda, t > 0$*

$$\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda |X_t|^\kappa} = \infty.$$

d) *If ψ is real-valued, then for any $\lambda, t, \kappa > 0$*

$$\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda |X_t|^{-\kappa}} = \infty.$$

Remark 3.4. **a)** Since ν is a Lévy measure, it is easy to see that (3.16) and (3.17) imply $M_{\kappa, \lambda} < \infty$.

b) It is well known, see e.g. [9, Theorem 26.1 (ii)], that

$$\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda |X_t| \log |X_t|} = \infty, \quad \lambda > 0$$

for any Lévy process with Lévy measure having unbounded support $\text{supp } \nu$. Since for any $\kappa > 1$ there exists a constant $C_\kappa > 0$ such that

$$e^{\lambda |x| \log |x|} \leq C_\kappa e^{\lambda |x|^\kappa}, \quad \lambda > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

this implies Theorem 3.3 c) if $\text{supp } \nu$ is unbounded; Theorem 3.3 c), however, is valid for all non-zero ν .

Proof of Theorem 3.3. **a)** Let $\hat{X}$ be a Lévy process in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with triplet $(0, 0, \nu)$. It is enough to show that

$$(3.18) \quad \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda |\hat{X}_t|^\kappa} \leq \mathbb{E} \exp \left[\lambda \left(\epsilon + |\hat{X}_t|^2 \right)^{\kappa/2} \right] \leq \exp \left[\lambda \epsilon^{\kappa/2} (1 + \epsilon^{-1} C_1 t) + C_2 t \right]$$

for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $t > 0$, where

$$C_1 := \frac{d}{2} \kappa (\lambda \kappa + 3 - \kappa) e^{2\lambda} \int_{0 < |y| < 1} |y|^2 \nu(dy), \quad C_2 := e^\lambda \int_{|y| \geq 1} e^{\lambda |y|^\kappa} \nu(dy) - \nu(|y| \geq 1).$$

Fix $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $t > 0$. Let

$$g(x) := \exp \left[\lambda \left(\epsilon + |x|^2 \right)^{\kappa/2} \right], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and define τ_n by (3.8). As in the proof of Theorem 3.1 a) we can use a Taylor expansion to get for $s < t \wedge \tau_n$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|y| \geq 1} \left(g(\widehat{X}_s + y) - g(\widehat{X}_s) \right) \nu(dy) &\leq C_2 g(\widehat{X}_s), \\ \int_{0 < |y| < 1} \left(g(\widehat{X}_s + y) - g(\widehat{X}_s) - y \cdot \nabla g(\widehat{X}_s) \right) \nu(dy) &\leq C_1 \lambda \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1} g(\widehat{X}_s). \end{aligned}$$

Now we use Dynkin's formula and Tonelli's theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[g(\widehat{X}_t) \mathbf{1}_{\{t < \tau_n\}} \right] - e^{\lambda \epsilon^{\kappa/2}} &\leq \mathbb{E} g(\widehat{X}_{t \wedge \tau_n}) - e^{\lambda \epsilon^{\kappa/2}} \\ &\leq (C_1 \lambda \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1} + C_2) \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \tau_n)} g(\widehat{X}_s) ds \right] \\ &= (C_1 \lambda \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1} + C_2) \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[g(\widehat{X}_s) \mathbf{1}_{\{s < \tau_n\}} \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

From Gronwall's inequality we see

$$\mathbb{E} \left[g(\widehat{X}_t) \mathbf{1}_{\{t < \tau_n\}} \right] \leq \exp \left[\lambda \epsilon^{\kappa/2} + (C_1 \lambda \epsilon^{\kappa/2-1} + C_2) t \right]$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Finally, (3.18) follows as $n \uparrow \infty$.

b) As in the proof of Theorem 3.1 b), we use Dynkin's formula, (3.6) and Tonelli's theorem to obtain that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda |\tilde{X}_t|^\kappa} \mathbf{1}_{\{t < \sigma_n\}} \right] - 1 &\leq \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda |\tilde{X}_{t \wedge \sigma_n}|^\kappa} - 1 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \sigma_n)} \left(\int_{y \neq 0} \left(e^{\lambda |\tilde{X}_s + y|^\kappa} - e^{\lambda |\tilde{X}_s|^\kappa} \right) \nu(dy) \right) ds \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \sigma_n)} \left(\int_{y \neq 0} e^{\lambda |\tilde{X}_s|^\kappa} (e^{\lambda |y|^\kappa} - 1) \nu(dy) \right) ds \right] \\ &= M_{\kappa, \lambda} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{[0, t \wedge \sigma_n)} e^{\lambda |\tilde{X}_s|^\kappa} ds \right] \\ &= M_{\kappa, \lambda} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda |\tilde{X}_s|^\kappa} \mathbf{1}_{\{s < \sigma_n\}} \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with Gronwall's inequality, yields that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda |\tilde{X}_t|^\kappa} \mathbf{1}_{\{t < \sigma_n\}} \right] \leq e^{M_{\kappa, \lambda} t}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It remains to let $n \uparrow \infty$ and use (3.6) to get the desired result.

c) Since $\nu \neq 0$ we may, without loss of generality, assume that there exist some Borel set $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}$ with either $\inf B_1 > 0$ or $\sup B_1 < 0$ and Borel sets $B_2, \dots, B_d \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$\eta := \nu(\Lambda) \in (0, \infty),$$

where $\Lambda := B_1 \times B_2 \times \dots \times B_d$. The jump times of jumps with size in the set Λ define a Poisson process, say $(N_t)_{t \geq 0}$, with intensity η . Note that X can be decomposed into two independent Lévy processes

$$X_t = X_t^{(1)} + X_t^{(2)}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $X^{(1)}$ is a compound Poisson process with Lévy measure $\nu|_{\Lambda}$, and $X^{(2)}$ is a Lévy process with Lévy measure $\nu - \nu|_{\Lambda}$; moreover, $X^{(1)}$ and $X^{(2)}$ are independent processes. Set

$$r := |\inf B_1| \wedge |\sup B_1| \in (0, \infty).$$

By the triangle inequality we find for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|X_t^{(1)} + y| \geq |X_t^{(1)}| - |y| \geq rN_t - |y|.$$

Using Stirling's formula

$$n! \leq \sqrt{2\pi n} n^{n+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-n+\frac{1}{12n}} \leq \sqrt{2\pi n} n^{n+1} e^{-n+1}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

we obtain that for any $\lambda, t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda|X_t^{(1)}+y|^\kappa} &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda(rN_t-|y|)^\kappa} \mathbb{1}_{\{rN_t>|y|\}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{n: rn>|y|} e^{\lambda(rn-|y|)^\kappa} \frac{(\eta t)^n e^{-\eta t}}{n!} \\ &\geq \frac{e^{-\eta t}}{\sqrt{2\pi} e} \sum_{n: rn>|y|} \frac{(\eta e t)^n e^{\lambda(rn-|y|)^\kappa}}{n^{n+1}} = \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the divergence is caused by $\kappa > 1$. Combining this with Tonelli's theorem, we get

$$\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda|X_t|^\kappa} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda|X_t^{(1)}+y|^\kappa} \mathbb{P}(X_t^{(2)} \in dy) = \infty.$$

d) This follows from Theorem 3.1 e) as we may choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n\kappa \geq d$ and

$$\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda|X_t|^{-\kappa}} \geq \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} \mathbb{E}|X_t|^{-n\kappa}. \quad \square$$

3.2. Subordinators. A subordinator is an increasing Lévy process in $\mathbb{R}$. Let $S = (S_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a subordinator with Bernstein function ϕ given by (1.1). Since S is a Lévy process, all results of Subsection 3.1 hold with X replaced by S .

The following example shows that the result in Theorem 3.1 b) is sharp for Gamma subordinators.

Example 3.5. Let $S = (S_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the Gamma process with parameters $\alpha, \beta > 0$; this is a subordinator with

$$b = 0, \quad \nu(dy) = \alpha y^{-1} e^{-\beta y} \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(y) dy.$$

It is known that the distribution of S_t at time $t > 0$ is a $\Gamma(\alpha t, \beta)$ -distribution, i.e.

$$\mathbb{P}(S_t \in dx) = \frac{\beta^{\alpha t}}{\Gamma(\alpha t)} x^{\alpha t-1} e^{-\beta x} \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(x) dx.$$

Let $\kappa \in (0, 1]$. Then we have

$$G(t) := \mathbb{E} S_t^\kappa = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha t + \kappa)}{\beta^\kappa \Gamma(\alpha t)}$$

and

$$H(t) := \inf_{\theta \in [\kappa, 1]} \left[t \int_{y>0} y^\theta \nu(dy) \right]^{\kappa/\theta} = \frac{1}{\beta^\kappa} \inf_{\theta \in [\kappa, 1]} [\alpha t \Gamma(\theta)]^{\kappa/\theta}.$$

It is easy to check that

$$\inf_{\theta \in [\kappa, 1]} [\alpha t \Gamma(\theta)]^{\kappa/\theta} = \begin{cases} \alpha \Gamma(\kappa) t, & \text{if } t \text{ is small enough,} \\ (\alpha t)^\kappa, & \text{if } t \text{ is large enough.} \end{cases}$$

Since

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{G(t)}{H(t)} = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha t + \kappa)}{\Gamma(\alpha t) \alpha \Gamma(\kappa) t} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\kappa)} \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha t + \kappa)}{\Gamma(\alpha t + 1)} = 1,$$

the upper bound in (3.4) is sharp for small t . Moreover, by Stirling's formula

$$(3.19) \quad \Gamma(x) \sim \sqrt{2\pi} x^{x-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-x}, \quad x \rightarrow \infty,$$

one has

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G(t)}{H(t)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha t + \kappa)}{\Gamma(\alpha t) (\alpha t)^\kappa} = \frac{1}{e^\kappa} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{\alpha t}\right)^{\alpha t + \kappa - \frac{1}{2}} = 1.$$

This means that (3.4) is also sharp as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

We will need the following Blumenthal–Gettoor index for subordinators

$$\sigma_\infty := \inf \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi(u)}{u^\alpha} = 0 \right\}.$$

Comparing this index with ρ_∞ defined in (2.2), it is easy to see that $0 \leq \rho_\infty \leq \sigma_\infty \leq 1$. It is well known, cf. [2], that

$$\sigma_\infty \geq \inf \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \int_{(0,1)} y^\alpha \nu(dy) < \infty \right\}$$

with equality holding for drift-free subordinators, i.e. $b = 0$ in (1.1). It is also not hard to see, cf. (3.2), that

$$\sigma_\infty = \inf \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \limsup_{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi(u)}{u^\alpha} < \infty \right\}.$$

Note that we can extend Bernstein functions analytically onto the right complex half-plane $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re} z > 0\}$ and continuously onto its closure $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re} z \geq 0\}$, see [11, Proposition 3.6]. Then the Lévy symbol of S is given by $\psi(\xi) = \phi(-i\xi)$ for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\frac{e-1}{e}(1 \wedge x) \leq 1 - e^{-x} \leq 1 \wedge x$ for all $x \geq 0$ and $|1 - e^{ix}| \leq 2 \wedge |x|$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(-i\xi)| &\leq b|\xi| + \int_{(0,\infty)} |1 - e^{i\xi x}| \nu(dx) \\ &\leq 2 \left(b|\xi| + \int_{(0,\infty)} (1 \wedge [|\xi|x]) \nu(dx) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{2e}{e-1} \phi(|\xi|). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that for any $\alpha > 0$

$$\limsup_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{\phi(u)}{u^\alpha} < \infty \quad \implies \quad \limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\phi(-i\xi)|}{|\xi|^\alpha} < \infty$$

and

$$\limsup_{u \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi(u)}{u^\alpha} < \infty \quad \implies \quad \limsup_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\phi(-i\xi)|}{|\xi|^\alpha} < \infty.$$

Thus, the following result is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1 c).

Corollary 3.6. *Assume that $\kappa \in (0, \sigma)$, where $\sigma \in (0, \sigma_0]$ and $\limsup_{u \downarrow 0} \phi(u)u^{-\sigma} < \infty$.⁸ Then*

$$\mathbb{E} S_t^\kappa \leq C_{\kappa, \sigma} (t \vee 1)^{\kappa/\sigma}, \quad t > 0.$$

⁸This is equivalent to either $0 < \sigma < \sigma_0$ or $\sigma = \sigma_0 > 0$ and $\limsup_{u \downarrow 0} \phi(u)u^{-\sigma_0} < \infty$.

If furthermore $\limsup_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)u^{-\sigma} < \infty$,⁹ then

$$\mathbb{E}S_t^\kappa \leq C_{\kappa,\sigma} t^{\kappa/\sigma}, \quad t > 0.$$

Remark 3.7. As in Remark 3.2 d), it is easy to see that Corollary 3.6 is sharp for the α -stable subordinator, $0 < \alpha < 1$.

Recall that σ_0 is defined by (2.1). Let

$$\rho_0 := \inf \left\{ \alpha : \liminf_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{\phi(u)}{u^\alpha} > 0 \right\} = \sup \left\{ \alpha : \liminf_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{\phi(u)}{u^\alpha} = 0 \right\}.$$

Because of (2.3), it is easy to see that $0 \leq \sigma_0 \leq \rho_0 \leq 1$.

The following result is essentially due to [6]. For the sake of completeness, we present the argument. The proof is based on the fact that the functions $x \mapsto x^{-\kappa}$ and $x \mapsto e^{\lambda x^{-\kappa}}$, $\kappa, \lambda, x > 0$, are completely monotone functions, cf. [11, Chapter 1].

Theorem 3.8. a) Let $\rho_\infty > 0$ and $\kappa > 0$. If for some $\rho \in (0, \rho_\infty]$, $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)u^{-\rho} > 0$,¹⁰ then for all $t > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}S_t^{-\kappa} \leq \frac{C_{\kappa,\rho}}{(t \wedge 1)^{\kappa/\rho}}.$$

If furthermore $\liminf_{u \downarrow 0} \phi(u)u^{-\rho} > 0$,¹¹ then for all $t > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}S_t^{-\kappa} \leq \frac{C_{\kappa,\rho}}{t^{\kappa/\rho}}.$$

b) Let $\rho_\infty > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, \rho_\infty/(1 - \rho_\infty))$. If $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)u^{-\rho} > 0$,¹² for some $\rho \in (\kappa/(1 + \kappa), \rho_\infty]$, then for all $\lambda, t > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda S_t^{-\kappa}} \leq \exp \left[C_{\kappa,\rho} \left(\lambda + \left(\frac{\lambda}{t^{\kappa/\rho}} \right)^{\frac{\rho}{\rho - (1-\rho)\kappa}} + \frac{\lambda}{t^{\kappa/\rho}} \right) \right].$$

In particular, for any $\lambda > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda S_t^{-\kappa}} \leq \exp \left[\frac{C_{\kappa,\rho,\lambda}}{(t \wedge 1)^{\frac{\kappa}{\rho - (1-\rho)\kappa}}} \right], \quad t > 0.$$

If furthermore $\liminf_{u \downarrow 0} \phi(u)u^{-\rho} > 0$,¹³ then for all $\lambda, t > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda S_t^{-\kappa}} \leq \exp \left[C_{\kappa,\rho} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{t^{\kappa/\rho}} \right)^{\frac{\rho}{\rho - (1-\rho)\kappa}} + \frac{\lambda}{t^{\kappa/\rho}} \right) \right].$$

c) Let $\sigma_\infty < 1$. If $\kappa > \sigma_\infty/(1 - \sigma_\infty)$, then for all $\lambda, t > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda S_t^{-\kappa}} = \infty.$$

Remark 3.9. Let S be an α -stable subordinator ($0 < \alpha < 1$). Then we can choose in Theorem 3.8 a) $\rho = \rho_\infty = \rho_0 = \alpha$. Note that $\mathbb{E}S_t^{-\kappa} = C_{\kappa,\alpha} t^{-\kappa/\alpha}$ for all $\kappa, t > 0$, see e.g. [9, (25.5)]. This means that Theorem 3.8 a) is sharp for α -stable subordinators.

⁹This is equivalent to either $\sigma_\infty < \sigma \leq \sigma_0$ or $\sigma = \sigma_\infty \in (0, \sigma_0]$ and $\limsup_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)u^{-\sigma_\infty} < \infty$.

¹⁰This is equivalent to either $0 < \rho < \rho_\infty$ or $\rho = \rho_\infty > 0$ and $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)u^{-\rho_\infty} > 0$.

¹¹This is equivalent to either $\rho_0 < \rho \leq \rho_\infty$ or $\rho = \rho_0 \in (0, \rho_\infty]$ and $\liminf_{u \downarrow 0} \phi(u)u^{-\rho_0} > 0$.

¹²This is equivalent to either $\kappa/(1 + \kappa) < \rho < \rho_\infty$ or $\rho = \rho_\infty > \kappa/(1 + \kappa)$ and $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)u^{-\rho_\infty} > 0$.

¹³This is equivalent to either $\frac{\kappa}{1 + \kappa} \vee \rho_0 < \rho \leq \rho_\infty$ or $\rho = \rho_0 \in (\kappa/(1 + \kappa), \rho_\infty]$ and $\liminf_{u \downarrow 0} \phi(u)u^{-\rho_0} > 0$.

Proof of Theorem 3.8. a) If $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)u^{-\rho} > 0$, then there exist constants $C_1 = C_1(\rho) > 0$ and $C_2 = C_2(\rho) \geq 0$ such that

$$(3.20) \quad \phi(u) \geq C_1 u^\rho, \quad u \geq C_2.$$

Combining this with (3.15), we obtain

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} S_t^{-\kappa} &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\kappa)} \int_0^\infty u^{\kappa-1} e^{-t\phi(u)} du \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\Gamma(\kappa)} \int_0^{C_2} u^{\kappa-1} du + \frac{1}{\Gamma(\kappa)} \int_0^\infty u^{\kappa-1} e^{-tC_1 u^\rho} du \\ &= \frac{C_2^\kappa}{\kappa \Gamma(\kappa)} + \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\kappa}{\rho}\right)}{\rho \Gamma(\kappa) (tC_1)^{\frac{\kappa}{\rho}}}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the first assertion. If furthermore $\liminf_{u \downarrow 0} \phi(u)u^{-\rho} > 0$, then (3.20) holds with $C_2 = 0$. Thus, the second estimate follows from (3.21) with $C_2 = 0$.

b) It follows from (3.15) that for $x \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\lambda x^{-\kappa}} &= 1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} \frac{1}{x^{n\kappa}} = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} \frac{1}{\Gamma(n\kappa)} \int_0^\infty u^{n\kappa-1} e^{-ux} du \\ &= 1 + \int_0^\infty e^{-ux} k(u) du, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$k(u) := \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\lambda^n}{n! \Gamma(n\kappa)} u^{n\kappa-1}, \quad u > 0.$$

Now we can use Tonelli's theorem to obtain

$$(3.22) \quad \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda S_t^{-\kappa}} = 1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-u S_t} k(u) du \right] = 1 + \int_0^\infty e^{-t\phi(u)} k(u) du.$$

If $\liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)u^{-\rho} > 0$, then by (3.20),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda S_t^{-\kappa}} &\leq 1 + \int_0^{C_2} k(u) du + \int_0^\infty e^{-C_1 t u^\rho} k(u) du \\ &= 1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\lambda^n C_2^{n\kappa}}{n! \Gamma(n\kappa) n\kappa} + \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\lambda^n \Gamma\left(\frac{n\kappa}{\rho}\right)}{n! \Gamma(n\kappa) (tC_1)^{\frac{n\kappa}{\rho}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2\pi} x^{x-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-x} &\leq \Gamma(x) \leq \sqrt{2\pi} x^{x-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-x+\frac{1}{12x}}, \quad x > 0, \\ n! &\geq \sqrt{2\pi} n^{n+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \end{aligned}$$

we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda S_t^{-\kappa}} &\leq 1 + \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{\kappa}} \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{(\lambda C_2^\kappa e^{\kappa+1} \kappa^{-\kappa})^n}{n n^{(1+\kappa)n}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\rho}} \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{e^{\rho/(12n\kappa)}}{\sqrt{n}} n^{\left(\frac{\kappa}{\rho}-\kappa-1\right)n} \left(\frac{e^{\kappa+1}}{\kappa^\kappa} \left(\frac{\kappa}{\rho e C_1} \right)^{\kappa/\rho} \frac{\lambda}{t^{\kappa/\rho}} \right)^n \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{\kappa}} \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{(\lambda C_2^\kappa e^{\kappa+1} \kappa^{-\kappa})^n}{n^{(1+\kappa)n}} \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{e^{\rho/(12\kappa)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\rho}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\left(\frac{\kappa}{\rho}-\kappa-1\right)n} \left(\frac{e^{\kappa+1}}{\kappa^\kappa} \left(\frac{\kappa}{\rho e C_1} \right)^{\kappa/\rho} \frac{\lambda}{t^{\kappa/\rho}} \right)^n.$$

Set $G := \lambda C_2^\kappa e^{\kappa+1} \kappa^{-\kappa}$; because of

$$(3.23) \quad n^n \geq n!, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{G^n}{n^{(1+\kappa)n}} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{G^n}{n^n} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{G^n}{n!} = e^G - 1.$$

Set

$$\epsilon := -\frac{\kappa}{\rho} + \kappa + 1 \in (0, 1] \quad \text{and} \quad H := \frac{e^{\kappa+1}}{\kappa^\kappa} \left(\frac{\kappa}{\rho e C_1} \right)^{\kappa/\rho} \frac{\lambda}{t^{\kappa/\rho}} > 0.$$

Using Jensen's inequality and (3.23), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{H^n}{n^{\epsilon n}} &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(2H)^{\frac{n}{\epsilon}}}{n^n} \right)^{\epsilon} \frac{1}{2^n} \leq \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2H)^{\frac{n}{\epsilon}}}{n^n} \frac{1}{2^n} \right)^{\epsilon} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{(2H)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}}{2} \right)^n \right)^{\epsilon} \\ &= \left(\exp \left[\frac{(2H)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}}{2} \right] - 1 \right)^{\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimates and using the following elementary inequalities

$$1 + z(e^x - 1)^y \leq e^{2xy + z(1+z)x^y} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2}e^x + \frac{1}{2}e^y \leq e^{x+y}, \quad x, y, z \geq 0,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda S_t^{-\kappa}} &\leq 1 + \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{\kappa}} (e^G - 1) + \frac{e^{\rho/(12\kappa)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\rho}} \left(\exp \left[(2H)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}/2 \right] - 1 \right)^{\epsilon} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{\kappa}} (e^G - 1) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2e^{\rho/(12\kappa)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\rho}} \left(\exp \left[(2H)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}/2 \right] - 1 \right)^{\epsilon} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \exp \left[\left(2 + \frac{1}{\pi^2\kappa} + \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{\kappa}} \right) G \right] + \frac{1}{2} \exp \left[(2H)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}\epsilon + \frac{2e^{\rho/(12\kappa)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\rho}} \left(\frac{2e^{\rho/(12\kappa)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\rho}} + 1 \right) \frac{2H}{2^\epsilon} \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left[\left(2 + \frac{1}{\pi^2\kappa} + \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{\kappa}} \right) G + \epsilon(2H)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} + 2^{2-\epsilon} \frac{e^{\rho/(12\kappa)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\rho}} \left(\frac{2e^{\rho/(12\kappa)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\rho}} + 1 \right) H \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the first assertion follows. If furthermore $\liminf_{u \downarrow 0} \phi(u)u^{-\rho} > 0$, then we can take $C_2 = 0$ and so $G = 0$. Hence, the desired assertion follows from the above estimate with $G = 0$.

c) Pick $\sigma \in (\sigma_\infty, \kappa/(1+\kappa))$. By the definition of σ_∞ , there exist two positive constants $C_3 = C_3(\sigma)$ and $C_4 = C_4(\sigma)$ such that

$$\phi(u) \leq C_3 u^\sigma, \quad u \geq C_4.$$

Together with (3.22) this yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda S_t^{-\kappa}} &\geq \int_{C_4}^{\infty} e^{-t\phi(u)} k(u) du \\ &\geq \int_{C_4}^{\infty} e^{-C_3 t u^\sigma} k(u) du \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^n}{n! \Gamma(n\kappa) (C_3 t)^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}}} \int_{C_3 C_4^\sigma t}^{\infty} u^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}-1} e^{-u} du \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^n}{n! \Gamma(n\kappa) (C_3 t)^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}}} \left[\Gamma\left(\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}\right) - \int_0^{C_3 C_4^\sigma t} u^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}-1} e^{-u} du \right] \\
&\geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^n}{n! \Gamma(n\kappa) (C_3 t)^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}}} \left[\Gamma\left(\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}\right) - \frac{\sigma}{n\kappa} (C_3 C_4^\sigma t)^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.19) and

$$n! \sim \sqrt{2\pi n} n^{n+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-n}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

we have for large $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\lambda^n}{n! \Gamma(n\kappa) (C_3 t)^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}}} \left[\Gamma\left(\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}\right) - \frac{\sigma}{n\kappa} (C_3 C_4^\sigma t)^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}} \right] \\
&\sim \frac{\lambda^n}{2\pi\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} n^{(1+\kappa)n} (e^{-\kappa-1} \kappa^\kappa (C_3 t)^{\frac{\kappa}{\sigma}})^n} \left[\sqrt{\frac{2\pi\sigma}{n\kappa}} n^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}} \left(\frac{\kappa}{\sigma e}\right)^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}} - \frac{\sigma}{n\kappa} (C_3 C_4^\sigma t)^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}} \right] \\
&\sim \frac{\lambda^n}{2\pi\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} n^{(1+\kappa)n} (e^{-\kappa-1} \kappa^\kappa (C_3 t)^{\frac{\kappa}{\sigma}})^n} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\sigma}{n\kappa}} n^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}} \left(\frac{\kappa}{\sigma e}\right)^{\frac{n\kappa}{\sigma}} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{2\pi}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} n^{(-1-\kappa+\frac{\kappa}{\sigma})n} \left(\frac{\lambda}{e^{-\kappa-1} \kappa^\kappa} \left(\frac{\kappa}{\sigma e C_3 t}\right)^{\frac{\kappa}{\sigma}} \right)^n,
\end{aligned}$$

which, because of $-1 - \kappa + \frac{\kappa}{\sigma} > 0$, tends to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

4. APPENDIX

In this section, we show that the index β_0 defined by (3.3) takes values in $[0, 2]$.

Without loss of generality we may assume that the Lévy measure $\nu \neq 0$; otherwise, the assertion is trivial. Since

$$1 - \cos u \geq (1 - \cos 1)u^2, \quad 0 \leq u \leq 1,$$

we have for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi(\xi)| &\geq \operatorname{Re} \psi(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \xi \cdot Q\xi + \int_{y \neq 0} (1 - \cos |\xi \cdot y|) \nu(dy) \\
&\geq \int_{y \neq 0, |\xi \cdot y| \leq 1} (1 - \cos |\xi \cdot y|) \nu(dy) \\
&\geq (1 - \cos 1) \int_{y \neq 0, |\xi \cdot y| \leq 1} |\xi \cdot y|^2 \nu(dy).
\end{aligned}$$

Because $\nu \neq 0$, we know that there exists a unit vector $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\nu_D := \mathbf{1}_D \nu \neq 0$, where

$$D := \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\} : \arccos \frac{x_0 \cdot z}{|z|} \in \left[0, \frac{\pi}{8}\right] \right\}.$$

Since $\xi, y \in D$ satisfy

$$0 \leq \arccos \frac{\xi \cdot y}{|\xi||y|} \leq \arccos \frac{\xi \cdot x_0}{|\xi|} + \arccos \frac{x_0 \cdot y}{|y|} \leq \frac{\pi}{8} + \frac{\pi}{8} = \frac{\pi}{4},$$

we see

$$\frac{\xi \cdot y}{|\xi||y|} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \xi, y \in D.$$

Thus, we get for all $\xi \in D$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(\xi) &\geq (1 - \cos 1) \int_{y \in D, |\xi \cdot y| \leq 1} |\xi \cdot y|^2 \nu(dy) \\ &\geq \frac{1 - \cos 1}{2} |\xi|^2 \int_{y \in D, |\xi \cdot y| \leq 1} |y|^2 \nu(dy),\end{aligned}$$

and, by Fatou's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{\xi \in D, |\xi| \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\psi(\xi)|}{|\xi|^2} &\geq \frac{1 - \cos 1}{2} \liminf_{\xi \in D, |\xi| \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\xi \cdot y| \leq 1\}} \nu_D(dy) \\ &\geq \frac{1 - \cos 1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^2 \liminf_{\xi \in D, |\xi| \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\xi \cdot y| \leq 1\}} \nu_D(dy) \\ &= \frac{1 - \cos 1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^2 \nu_D(dy) \in (0, \infty].\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\beta_0 \leq 2$.

Acknowledgement. The authors would like to thank an anonymous referee for her/his insightful comments and useful suggestions which helped to improve the presentation of our manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Berg, G. Forst, Potential Theory on Locally Compact Abelian Groups, Springer, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, II. Ser. Bd. 87, Berlin, 1975.
- [2] R.M. Blumenthal, R.K. Gettoor, Sample functions of stochastic processes with stationary independent increments, J. Math. Mech. 10 (1961) 493–516.
- [3] C.-S. Deng, Harnack inequalities for SDEs driven by subordinate Brownian motions, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 417 (2014) 970–978.
- [4] C.-S. Deng, R.L. Schilling, On a Cameron–Martin type quasi-invariance theorem and applications to subordinate Brownian motions, arXiv:1502.06107.
- [5] N. Jacob, Pseudo Differential Operators and Markov Processes (Volume I), Imperial College Press, London, 2001.
- [6] M. Gordina, M. Röckner, F.-Y. Wang, Dimension-independent Harnack inequalities for subordinated semigroups, Potential Anal. 34 (2011) 293–307.
- [7] H. Luschgy, G. Pagès, Moment estimates for Lévy processes, Electron. Commun. Probab. 13 (2008) 422–434.
- [8] P.W. Millar, Path behavior of processes with stationary independent increments, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Geb. 17 (1971) 53–73.
- [9] K. Sato, Lévy Processes and Infinitely Divisible Distributions, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [10] R.L. Schilling, Growth and Hölder conditions for the sample paths of Feller processes. Probab. Theory Related Fields 112 (1998) 565–611.
- [11] R.L. Schilling, R. Song, Z. Vondraček, Bernstein Functions. Theory and Applications (2nd Edn), De Gruyter, Studies in Mathematics 37, Berlin, 2012.
- [12] R.L. Schilling, J. Wang, Functional inequalities and subordination: stability of Nash and Poincaré inequalities, Math. Z. 272 (2012) 921–936.
- [13] F.-Y. Wang, Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities on noncompact Riemannian manifolds, Probab. Theory Related Fields 109 (1997) 417–424.
- [14] F.-Y. Wang: Harnack Inequalities for Stochastic Partial Differential Equations, Springer, New York, 2013.
- [15] F.-Y. Wang, Integration by parts formula and applications for SDEs with Lévy noise, arXiv:1308.5799.
- [16] F.-Y. Wang, Integration by parts formula and shift Harnack inequality for stochastic equations, Ann. Probab. 42 (2014) 994–1019.
- [17] F.-Y. Wang, J. Wang, Harnack inequalities for stochastic equations driven by Lévy noise, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 410 (2014) 513–523.

- [18] L. Wang, X. Zhang, Harnack inequalities for SDEs driven by cylindrical α -stable processes, *Potential Anal.* 42 (2015) 657–669.

(C.-S. Deng) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WUHAN UNIVERSITY, WUHAN 430072, CHINA

Current address: TU Dresden, Fachrichtung Mathematik, Institut für Mathematische Stochastik, 01062 Dresden, Germany

E-mail address: `dengcs@whu.edu.cn`

(R.L. Schilling) TU DRESDEN, FACHRICHTUNG MATHEMATIK, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATISCHE STOCHASTIK, 01062 DRESDEN, GERMANY

E-mail address: `rene.schilling@tu-dresden.de`